

REMARKS

The present Amendment amends claims 1-11 and cancels claims 12-14. Therefore, the present application has pending claims 1-11.

The Abstract stands objected to due to informalities noted by the Examiner in paragraph 3 of the Office Action. The Abstract has been amended so as to bring it into conformity with the requirements of U.S. practice. Therefore, this objection is overcome and should be withdrawn.

The title of the invention stands objected to as not being descriptive of the present invention. The title of the invention was changed to METHOD, APPARATUS AND MEMORY MEANS FOR MEDIATING IN A CUSTOMIZED FORM TO SHARE INFORMATION BETWEEN A TRANSMITTER SITE AND A VIEWER SITE" which Applicants submit is descriptive of the present invention. Therefore, this objection is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-4, 7 and 8 stands objected to due to informalities noted by the Examiner in paragraphs 5-9 of the Office Action. Amendments were made to claims 1-4, 7 and 8 so as to correct the informalities noted by the Examiner. Therefore, these objections are overcome and should be withdrawn.

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 USC §101 being that the Examiner alleges that the language used in the claim raises a question as to whether the claim is directed merely to an abstract idea. Amendments were made to claim 11 to clarify that such claim is directed to a computer readable memory having stored thereon a program implemented by a computer. Thus, the claim is directed to an article of

manufacture which is permitted under 35 USC §101. Therefore, the 35 USC §101 rejection of claim 11 is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 11 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Call (U.S. Patent No. 6,418,441); claims 5, 6, 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Khemlani (U.S. Patent No. 6,772,146); claim 3 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Call in view of Tsimelzon (U.S. Patent No. 6,834,306); and claims 7 and 8 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Khemlani in view of Call. These rejections are traversed for the following reasons. Applicants submit that the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in claims 1-11 are not taught or suggested by Call, Khemlani or Tsimelzon whether taken individually or in combination with each other as suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw these rejections.

Amendments were made to each of the claims so as to more clearly recite that the present invention is directed to, for example, a method, apparatus and computer program for mediating in a customized form to share information between a transmitter site and a viewer site employing an information sharing apparatus coupled to with an information transmitting apparatus for transferring information and an information viewing apparatus for viewing the information through a network. The present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims includes receiving an access from the information transmitting apparatus or the information viewing apparatus by the information sharing apparatus, sending a menu information to the transmitting apparatus when the information sharing apparatus accepts the

information transmitting apparatus and the information viewing apparatus as a transmitter and when customization for the information transmitting apparatus and the information viewing apparatus has been granted, storing both an identifier for identifying the transmitting apparatus and customization information for determining an indication form of the information, in such a way that the identifier and the customization information are associated with each other, receiving the information and the identifier from the information transmitting apparatus, storing the received information in storage units corresponding to the identifier, receiving from the information viewing apparatus a request for viewing partial information included in the stored information, searching for customization information corresponding to an identifier of the partial information and indicating on the information viewing apparatus the partial information in an indication form based upon the customization information retrieved as a result of the search.

The above described features of the present invention now more clearly recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by Call, Tsimelzon and Khemlani whether taken individually or in combination with each other as suggested by the Examiner.

Call discloses a method and apparatus for disseminating information over the Internet wherein such information is maintained by product manufacturers using existing universal product codes as access keys. As taught by Call, preferred web data storage formats are used so as to display the product information on a display screen. However, at no point is there any teaching or suggestion in Call which

allows for the transmitter which request access to such data to receive customized data depending upon the transmitter as in the present invention.

In the present invention as more recited in the claims the information sharing apparatus is coupled with an information transmitting apparatus and information viewing apparatus such that information sharing apparatus sends a menu having selectable information to the information transmitting apparatus when the information sharing apparatus accepts the information transmitting apparatus or the information viewing apparatus as a transmitter and when customization for the information transmitting apparatus or the information viewing apparatus has been granted. The Examiner's attention is directed to the steps of the present invention which are illustrated, for example, in Fig. 2 of the present application. Unique according to the present invention is steps S130, S140, S40, S50 and S150. According to these steps once the transmitter has been authenticated customization information is sent to the transmitter so as to allow the transmitter to select different customizations such as, for example, illustrated in Fig. 5. Such features allowing for reflection of the appropriate customization is not taught or suggested by Call.

Thus, Call fails to teach or suggest receiving an access from the information transmitting apparatus or the information viewing apparatus by the information sharing apparatus and sending a menu information to the transmitting apparatus when the information sharing apparatus accepts the information transmitting apparatus as a transmitter and when customization for the information transmitting apparatus has been granted as recited in the claims.

Therefore, as is clear from the above, the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by Call.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §102(e) rejection of claims 1, 2, 4 and 11 as being anticipated by Call is respectfully requested.

The above noted deficiencies of Call are not supplied by Khemlani or Tsimelzon. Therefore, combining the teachings of Call with one more of Khemlani or Tsimelzon still fails to teach or suggest the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims.

Both Khemlani and Tsimelzon are deficient of the same features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims as Call. Thus, both Khemlani and Call fail to teach or suggest receiving an access from the information transmitting apparatus or the information viewing apparatus by the information sharing apparatus, and sending a menu information to the transmitting apparatus when the information sharing apparatus accepts the information transmitting apparatus or the information viewing apparatus as a transmitter and when customization for the information transmitting apparatus or the information viewing apparatus has been granted as recited in the claims.

Therefore, both Khemlani and Tsimelzon suffer from the same deficiencies relative to the features of the present invention as recited in the claims as Call. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §102(e) rejection of claims 5, 6, 9 and 10 as being anticipated by Khemlani, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 3 as being unpatentable over Call in view of Tsimelzon and the 35

USC §103(a) rejection of claims 7 and 8 as being unpatentable over Khemlani in view of Call are respectfully requested.

The remaining references of record have been studied. Applicants submit that they do not supply any of the deficiencies noted above with respect to the references utilized in the rejection of claims 1-11.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicants submit that claims 1-11 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of claims 1-11 is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, the applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1417 (520.41389X00).

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.



Carl I. Brundidge
Registration No. 29,621

CIB/jdc
(703) 684-1120